

1 PATRICK H. HICKS, ESQ., Bar # 4632  
2 SANDRA KETNER, ESQ., Bar #8527  
3 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
4 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway  
5 Suite 300  
6 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5937  
7 Telephone: 702.862.8800  
8 Fax No.: 702.862.8811

9 Attorneys for Defendant  
10 VICTORIA PARTNERS dba  
11 MONTE CARLO RESORT AND CASINO

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

13 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

14 CLAUDIA CARLSON and JOSHUA  
15 HALL,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 VICTORIA PARTNERS d/b/a MONTE  
19 CARLO RESORT AND CASINO,

20 Defendant.

21 Case No. 2:13-cv-00378-JCM-PAL

22 **DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO  
23 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO  
24 FILE EXCESS PAGES**

25 Apparently under the misimpression that more is better, Plaintiffs' Motion asks for  
26 permission to file an opposition brief well in excess of the limit specifically set forth in the Local  
27 Rules. Defendant Victoria Partners d/b/a Monte Carlo Resort and Casino (hereinafter "Defendant")  
28 hereby opposes Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages. Local Rule 56-1 requires that  
"[m]otions for summary judgment and responses thereto shall include a *concise* statement setting  
forth each fact material to the disposition of the motion, which the party claims is or is not genuinely  
in issue . . ." LR 56-1 (*emphasis added*). Accordingly, Local Rule 7-4 limits the length of briefs in  
support of or in response to motion to thirty (30) pages. LR 7-4.

29 On June 26, 2014, Defendant moved for summary judgment in its favor on all of Plaintiffs'  
30 claims. (Dkt. 70). Defendant fully complied with the local rules by setting forth a *concise* statement  
31 of undisputed facts. Defendant further complied with the page limit set by the local rules by

1 ensuring its Motion for Summary Judgment was well less than 30 pages. As a professional courtesy,  
 2 Defendant granted Plaintiffs a one week extension to file their response to Defendant's Motion for  
 3 Summary Judgment. (Dkt. 73). Now Plaintiffs seek to extend the page limit of their response to an  
 4 excessive 40 pages. (Dkt. 74). As demonstrated below, there is no basis for Plaintiffs' request to  
 5 exceed the page limitations set forth by the Local Rules.

6 Defendant seeks summary judgment in its favor due to the legal deficiency of Plaintiffs'  
 7 claims. There is nothing unique or complicated about the legal arguments at issue. Specifically,  
 8 Defendant argues that Plaintiffs failed to exhaust their administrative remedies, failed to identify  
 9 alleged unlawful conduct within the applicable statute of limitations, and failed to identify sufficient  
 10 facts to establish *prima facie* claims for harassment and retaliation. Plaintiffs and their counsel  
 11 apparently believe this Court and its staff don't have enough to do without expanding their brief by  
 12 25% of what the Local Rules allow—an invitation to unnecessary and repetitive briefing on pretty  
 13 simple issues.<sup>1</sup> Defendant respectfully requests that this Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to  
 14 File Excess Pages.

15 Dated: July 23, 2014

16  
 17  
 18 /s/  
 19 PATRICK H. HICKS, ESQ.  
 20 SANDRA KETNER, ESQ.  
 21 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

22 Attorneys for Defendant  
 23 VICTORIA PARTNERS dba  
 24 MONTE CARLO RESORT AND CASINO

25  
 26  
 27 <sup>1</sup> Defendant notes that LR 7-4 limits its reply brief in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment to twenty (20) pages.  
 28 However, if Plaintiffs are permitted to file a forty (40) page response, Defendant will likely require additional pages (*i.e.*,  
 up to 30 pages) to reply to Plaintiffs' excessively lengthy brief.

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am a resident of the State of Nevada, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 400, Reno, Nevada 89501. On July 23, 2014, I served the within document(s):

**DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
EXCESS PAGES**

- By CM/ECF Filing – Pursuant to FRCP 5(b)(3) and LR 5-4, the above-referenced document was electronically filed and served upon the parties listed below through the Court’s Case Management and Electronic Case Filing (CM/ECF) system:

Law Offices of Robert Spretnak  
Robert Spretnak, Esq.  
8275 S. Eastern Avenue  
Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89123

Law Offices of Joshua Friedman  
Joshua Friedman, Esq.  
Giselle Schuetz, Esq.  
1050 Seven Oaks Lane  
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing and for shipping via overnight delivery service. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service or if an overnight delivery service shipment, deposited in an overnight delivery service pick-up box or office on the same day with postage or fees thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 23, 2014, at Reno, Nevada.

/s/

---

Esperansa Reinold

Firmwide:128079991.1 060736.1054